



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(p. 151). Under the discussion of adjectives (p. 14) we find: "Note that in the body of a sentence adjectives are never written with capitals. Ex. *Le garçon français est agréable.*" According to this the student would presumably use a capital in a sentence like: *J'ai un livre français*, especially as nothing has been offered in the way of specific treatment of the use of capitals in French. The author's adherence to the old classification of verbs into four conjugations will impress many teachers unfavorably. The uses of *vingt* and *cent*, with or without plural mark, are discussed twice (pp. 30 and 79). On page 45, "ma mère joue le piano, ma sœur joue le violon" needs correction; same remark for "je vais jouer le piano" (p. 46). On page 53, the author implies that the *w* in French *tramway* has the same sound as in French *wagon*. The general vocabularies make no claim to be complete, and the author attempts to justify their incompleteness. It is to be feared, however, that they will frequently be found inadequate to the needs of the average student.

Excellent characteristics of the book are: the arrangement of the lesson vocabularies and their position at the beginning of the lesson (though some teachers will doubtless think them too long); sets of review questions and exercises; and a series of very interesting reading selections on the climate, aspect, government, history, and other features of France. These latter are especially well chosen and simply phrased. There appears also a quite sufficient amount of material about getting to Paris and doing and seeing things at Paris, but the author's restraint in this direction is apparent, and is refreshing when one thinks of the excessive quantity of matter of this kind found in some grammars and composition books. The statements concerning the uses of the French past participle are particularly lucid. And it is a pleasure to add that the volume is splendidly printed and gives evidence of careful proof-reading.

B. L. BOWEN.

Ohio State University.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS CONCERNING MONTESQUIEU

Montesquieu, par J. DEDIEU. (*Les Grands Philosophes.*) Paris, Alcan, 1913. viii+358 pp.

Correspondance de Montesquieu, edited by F. GEBELIN and A. MORIZE. (*Collection bordelaise.*) 2 vols. Paris, Champion, 1914.

Lettres persanes by Montesquieu, edited by R. L. CRU. New York, Oxford Press, 1914. xxvii + 312 pp.

Our knowledge of Montesquieu has nearly doubled in the last generation. Since the biography of Vian (1878) and the excellent general criticism of Sorel (1887), there has been gathered a mass of material that renders necessary, in each direction, a freshly munitioned attack. The biography is still lacking, but M. Dedieu has furnished the new criticism, and both fields are now greatly illumined by the publication of the long-desired full Correspondence.

Before these, the Montesquiviana made available since 1891 included first of all the *Collection bordelaise*. This valuable store of *inédits* comprises several of Montesquieu's minor works, as well as his *Voyages* and his *Pensées et fragments*. Also, M. Barchhausen had drawn from the archives of La Brède material for a volume illustrating anew Montesquieu's main ideas and his masterpieces. Critical editions of the latter, excluding the *Esprit des lois*, had been published with full apparatus obtained from the archives. Furthermore, a quantity of monographs, dissertations, articles, attest the interest of our age in the philosopher whose light had rather waned since the epoch of the Restoration.

I

The way was surely open for a synthetic study which would press into service both the monuments themselves and the labors of the later devotees. This study M. Dedieu has attempted, so far as regards the chief divisions of Montesquieu's thought. That, indeed, is the chief object and value of his volume: to

make a progressive analysis of Montesquieu's mind, as it developed amid contemporary opinion.

The chapters treat: the formation of Montesquieu's intelligence; the origins of his sociological method; his political and moral ideas; his social, his economic, and finally his religious ideas. There are added a conclusion, appendices, a chronological table of the works, and the best bibliography since Vian.

The analysis is progressive—and this is a distinct feature—in that a constant effort is made to mark the stages of Montesquieu's *pensée évolutive*, not only through the chief works and here and there in the pages of the *Collection bordelaise*, but also, for example, in additions made to the *Lettres persanes* or in a later book of the *Esprit des lois* as offsetting an earlier. The *disjecta membra* of Montesquieu's body politic are articulated and, as far as possible, dated. This frequently needs delicate construction and interpretation. Fortunately, the way has been partially cleared by previous researches.

Previous researches, again, largely M. Dedieu's own, have prepared for the second feature of this *enquête*—to wit, Montesquieu is not viewed as a solitary star, but is set firmly in his proper galaxy. He is seen as adopting the interests of his time, as approving, or more often reacting against the theories and solutions then favored; in either case, this great relativist always relates, this strong believer in *rapports* is usually *en rapport* himself.

The advantages of such a sociological approach, with emphasis on vogue as the soil of thought, are coming to be more and more appreciated. They are conspicuous in the treatment of M. Dedieu, who in his previous work on a similar subject¹ had drawn largely from the French and English political speculations of the time. These now reappear—Melon, Mandeville, Locke, Warburton—as the probable sources of much in the *Esprit des lois*. Aside from that, the writer uses names and documents less well-known, contemporary discus-

sions and events, a nexus capably controlled and displayed on the threshold of each serious topic, as providing the "mental hinterland" of Montesquieu. The main objection here is simply in the matter of arrangement; repetitions of certain passages and of undoubted influences such as those of Aristotle and Locke, might well have been avoided by a more compact array.

Finally, as regards the general features, M. Dedieu, in reviewing Montesquieu's religious development, finds a growing conservatism and a respect for faith—a truth slightly tinged by the apparent orthodoxy of the critic.

Among the individual points which M. Dedieu emphasizes, the following are of especial interest. Montesquieu's taste for positive realities was strikingly encouraged by his scientific studies, which combined with his travels to modify what was too *livresque* or ideal in his first conceptions of government. England, though bringing the final light, left nevertheless the French parliamentarian and aristocrat to construct an amalgamated constitutional monarchy: "le chef-d'œuvre de législation qui demeure la suprême pensée politique de Montesquieu." Further, it appears that in the *Esprit des lois* we have for ten books relics of the absolutist, holding by "eternal justice" and equity, and of the Cartesian, who exhausts by abstract definition and analysis. The method of these books is then mainly anterior to the visit to England, and the persistence of such systematizing is seen throughout in the forcible relating of many phenomena to the kinds of government and their principles. Still, in the subsequent books, we are nearer the scientific spirit which takes facts as it finds them and forswears all but true causal relationships. When Montesquieu found a new *rapport* he added a new book, and towards the end of the monument illustrative books are appended without much regard for inner necessity.

M. Dedieu practically admits then the piecemeal character which remains, *pace* M. Barckhausen, the artistic fault as it is, perhaps, the jurisprudential merit of the *Esprit des lois*. Its lack of unity does not prevent its taking

¹ *Montesquieu et la tradition politique anglaise en France. Les sources anglaises de l'Esprit des lois.* Paris, Lecoivre, 1909.

rank as mainly a series of truths, elaborated at different times, under different inspirations.

Montesquieu's "sociological method" consists in his inauguration of the comparative study of nations and laws, exoticism and ethnography; the endeavor to establish facts first (though here he sometimes failed), and then to derive their moral and physical causes. The latter yield to the former, it is the plausible view of M. Dedieu, in spite of the importance given to climate and *terrain*. This overthrows the conventional pigeonholing of Montesquieu, and yet it seems supported, not only by the supereminent rôle given to *mœurs* (which are placed even above laws), but by various passages in the Correspondence. Physical causes predominate in the first part of the *Lois*, moral in the last, whether or not this is a conscious division of Montesquieu's. The conclusion is that here, as in religion, we have a growing idealism and conservatism in the author's standards.

That this marked traditionalism turned Montesquieu's face away from the idea of progress, making him rather a partisan of stability in most things, is a favorite thesis of M. Dedieu's, to which we shall return. The philosopher's social ideas, at any rate, in matters concerning slavery, war, and penal laws, are of the humanitarian and forward-looking cast. The valuable part of his political economy is the theory of cosmopolitan interchange and *concurrence* as tending towards general happiness. One of his most notable moral ideas, indeed, is that individual satisfaction can rarely be purchased at the expense of "l'esprit général."

This is an imperfect telescoping of M. Dedieu's analysis, and similar *lacunae* must occur in an attempt to point out what seem his more debatable propositions.

P. 3.—The statement that Montesquieu touched only with precaution on dangerous problems in government scarcely applies to the *Lettres persanes*; their *frondeur* tone is amply admitted by M. Dedieu himself (pp. 14 f.).

Pp. 5, 10, 22, 26, 74, etc.—The opposition between "scientific" and "bookish" notions, while sound in the main, seems, when elaborately applied, a forced extension of latter-day

academic antinomies. Without denying the importance of Montesquieu's travels, I think his "contact with realities" *via* Holland is overdone. Certain such contacts can also be found in his early experiences at home (see pp. 21-23).

P. 16.—The (psychological) "puissance d'observation" and the "regard de moraliste" credited to the *Lettres persanes* may be too highly praised.

P. 21.—The objection to viewing Montesquieu as a constant spirit and the insistence on his evolution are good points. But need they overthrow the *vérité acquise* that the germs of the political thought of the *Esprit des lois* are discernible in the *Lettres persanes*?

P. 42.—It is a far cry from the passage in the *Republic* on the stability of games to Montesquieu's cautions regarding the spirit of the French nation.

P. 52.—The suggestion that the Italian political thinkers do not figure among Montesquieu's masters is negated—to say nothing of Vico—by the influences of Machiavelli, Doria, and Gravina, whom M. Dedieu had just analyzed.

Pp. 94, 196, 285, 321-22.—The most serious objection should be made to M. Dedieu's excessive statement: "L'idée d'évolution, de progrès, est totalement absente de la pensée de Montesquieu." In a conscious modern sense, this is almost true. But there are various passages which indicate that the struggling concept of progress, that prince of eighteenth-century ideas, informs the farther reaches of Montesquieu's thought. *E. g.*, No. 106 of the *Lettres persanes*, concerning the advance in 'arts' and inventions.² The critic partially restores this concept to Montesquieu near the end of his discussion.

P. 120.—How, historically, did Montesquieu's political idealism "inaugurate the spiritualistic reaction"?

P. 180.—The notion of censorship applies only to republics, but it is quoted in connection with the monarchical scheme. (Smaller

² See also *E. L.*, Bk. X, iii; XII, ii; X and XV, *passim*; *Corresp.*, II, 356, etc.

contradictions are found on pp. 206 f., 245 f., 309 and 315, etc.)

P. 251.—The President's insistence on international commerce was probably stimulated by the sale of his wine in England.

P. 284.—Overstatement: "Ce farouche ennemi de l'idée religieuse est néanmoins le plus ardent apologiste de l'idée de progrès." Both clauses seem too emphatic, even though applying to the author of the *Lettres persanes*, and the use of *néanmoins* is decidedly curious. Throughout the eighteenth century enemies of Catholicism were also defenders of tolerance. *Il y avait de quoi*.

P. 285.—"Rien aujourd'hui ne demeure des objections que ce philosophe dressait contre la foi." The objections, which are of the same character as those of Voltaire, have of course just as much or as little validity as the reader's mind and temperament are inclined to accord them.

P. 311.—The letter to the parliamentarian³ is hardly as favorable to the clerical cause as here suggested.

P. 331.—French Anglomania had slackened before 1750; and it revived again, in certain directions, during the two decades preceding the Revolution.

P. 331.—Did Montesquieu's authority lose all value in 1789? There is a general impression that the milder Revolutionaries were still under his influence, which waned with the advent of the Terror.

P. 342.—The *Essai sur le goût* must have been written at least by 1753, since the *Correspondance*⁴ then mentions it.

The bibliography, which does not aim at fulness, is selected with discrimination, and contains, as regards French works, most of the titles that one would expect. The chief omissions concern Montesquieu's travels, his *relations*, and the *Grandeur et décadence des Romains*. Since M. Dedieu regrets the lack of material on these matters, one may add certain titles of that nature, together with a few others, out of a large store, which seem to deserve inclusion. The following list contains little or

nothing already found in Vian's or in Lanson's bibliography.

Brunet, G.—"On the Library of Montesquieu," *Bulletin de l'alliance des arts*, Vol. IV (1845), pp. 33-36.

Cantù, C.—"Montesquieu in Italia," *Nuova Antologia*, 3rd series, LIV, 561-72.

Doumic, R.—"Voyages de Montesquieu," *Revue des deux mondes*, CXLII (1897), 924-35.

Fournier de Flaix.—*Les Voyages de Montesquieu*, Paris, 1897.

Hardy, F.—*Memoirs of the Earl of Charlemont*, London (?), 1812, I, 160-73.

Hadamczik.—*Wodurch unterscheidet sich Montesquieu und seine 'Considérations' von den älteren französischen Historikern?* Progr., Crotoschin, 1878.

Ilbert, Sir Courtenay.—*Montesquieu*, Oxford, 1904. (Romanes Lecture.)

Malet.—"Discours de réception à Montesquieu," *Œuvres*, London, 1740, Vol. VII.

Sakmann.—"Voltaire als Kritiker Montesquieus," *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen*, CXIII, 374 f.

Schérer, E.—"Comment il faut lire Montesquieu," *Études sur la littérature contemporaine*, Paris, 1889, IX, 238-54.

Seidel, E.—*Montesquieus Verdienst um die römische Geschichte*, Annaberg, 1887.

II

M. Dedieu did not have the good fortune to write after the publication of the *Correspondance*. This enterprise, begun by M. Raymond Céléste, has been carried through by M. François Gebelin, with the collaboration of M. André Morize. The value of the undertaking is apparent: the last (Laboulaye's) collection of Montesquieu's letters contained about 150 by his own hand, while here we have three times that number. Over 200 more are added from friends to Montesquieu, making a total of 679 letters, illuminating the man and his period far more satisfactorily than anything hitherto. A thorough index helps greatly in referring to these volumes.

The editors have used principally the archives of La Brède. Many of Montesquieu's letters are there preserved in his manuscript copies, and the letters of his correspondents are likewise found plentifully. Others have been added from various quarters; their respectable quantity implies much industry on the part

³ *Corresp.*, II, 472-78.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 492; also in Laboulaye, VII, 422.

of the editors, who have also republished correspondence heretofore scattered in various volumes.

Towards the end of Vol. II those letters thicken which have already appeared in Laboulaye, and indeed half of the whole Correspondence belongs to the last five years of Montesquieu's life. There are many short notes, showing the President's *sécheresse*; his leaning to maxims and epigrams is also illustrated. There is a good deal of waste matter, especially in the letters of others. Montesquieu himself is generally interesting, save when dealing with technical affairs and barring the natural repetition of sentiments and phrases.

The editorial work has been done discreetly, with sensible reconstructing and altering when necessary. Otherwise, the editors scarcely appear, save in the brief Introduction, where a history of the Correspondence is given. Here, by the way, the Abbé Guasco is let off rather easily, since his marauding hand is surely visible more than once in Montesquieu's epistles. The President's *brouillons* are carefully described; it is pointed out how his numerous corrections and erasures (conspicuous, we may say, in love-letters) reveal his "conscience d'écrivain"; cautions are given concerning annotations and datings by another hand; finally, the wide range and interest of the Correspondence are emphasized.

This is certainly the first point that impresses one in the letters. Restricted, of course, as compared to the circle of Voltaire, Montesquieu's better selected correspondents yet represent rather completely the more intellectual phases of eighteenth-century society. The world of the *philosophes* and of the *salon* women is thoroughly displayed. Not so representative is the time-distribution of the letters, which leaves several periods almost voiceless, among them the period of Montesquieu's siege of the Academy, as well as his sojourn in England. Between 1734 and 1742, again, the Correspondence covers only forty pages.

What we newly learn, or the matters concerning which our knowledge is much re-enforced, may fall under these headings: ⁵ Mon-

tesquieu's character, his business, his domestic relations, his love-affairs, his friendships, his Anglomania, his interest in the Academies and the physical sciences, and his own works. One may add to these certain information about the period.

In character, Montesquieu stands out much as he has hitherto been known. His stoicism is manifested in connection with various troubles, particularly the partial loss of his eyesight. He gives some expression of this doctrine, while defending his admiration for Marcus Antoninus.⁶ He appears as tranquil even when some of his feminine friends think he ought to be moved. He relishes the studious quiet of the country, frequently opposing it to the hollowness of Paris.

The word *modération* occurs often in his later letters and is associated with that tolerant spirit which his friends appreciated. The flatterer Castel praises Montesquieu's adaptability. His contempt for war is conspicuous; his *bienfaisance* is exhibited in his dealings with his laborers, his succoring of La Beaumelle, Piron, etc.

His aristocratic leanings are evident. He is bitter against the *traitants* and financiers, he distrusts authorship and whatever smacks of specialism, while his personal pride is manifest. He has a poor opinion of princes and of *petits-mâîtres*, and a rather better opinion of himself. He likes etiquette and dignity. His qualities of leadership are evidenced in connection with the Bordeaux Academy and with the affairs of his family.

He is absent-minded, and is occasionally rallied on that account by fair correspondents. He forgets engagements, arrives late, and needs directing. He seems a little *sauvage* and rustic after a long stay in the country.

In business matters, he shows interest in his farms and tenants. He is not keen concerning legal details and does not bother about trifling impositions. His island, his trees and garden, and especially his wine, are often mentioned. He is occupied with removing the tax on the *vin du pays*, he receives and fills orders, exports to England, and generally takes pride in his

⁵ I do not dwell on material already in Laboulaye.

⁶ II, 304-05.

vineyard, which must have been quite a lucrative enterprise.

He sells his *charge* as President of the Bordeaux Parlement, cleverly arranging to keep the reversion for his son. In putting through the marriage of his daughter, he declares, in reasonable self-appraisal: "*Je suis un bon homme d'affaires.*"⁷

This marriage offers a good illustration of his rôle as the head of a family. He masterfully arranges a match between his daughter and a cousin, for the purpose of keeping up the family estates. He shows generosity as regards the dower, dispenses with the *corbeille*, and lets the bridegroom know his pleasure as to the place and style of the wedding. After their marriage, he looks out for the business interests of the young people. This daughter, Denise, was his favorite, and his letters to her evince much affection, together always with a masterful superiority. The same quality shines in dealings with and for his rather helpless brother, as well as with his son, his son-in-law, etc. As for Montesquieu's wife, she scarcely appears. We have no letter bearing that address, though she once writes to her husband in a somewhat pathetic, cajoling manner.⁸ Montesquieu repeatedly states his view that marriage ruins love.

That he sought elsewhere. To affairs of the heart he gives usually a conventionally gallant expression, compact of sensuality, sighs, and compliments. He has no great opinion of women in general; he uses a blunt tone with several and brusquely breaks off with several more. "Il y a un sexe entier sur lequel on ne peut pas compter."⁹ However, he attains to a more passionate tone in writing to the *innominata* of Letter 57 and to the Princesse Trivulce in Italy.

His general *relations*, especially with friends and the ladies of the *salons*, show a warmer heart. To the former he is all helpfulness and affection. He holds that *les honnêtes gens* think first of other people,¹⁰ and he thinks of

his friends very often. These would include Hénault, Fontenelle, Maupertuis, as well as the Duchesse d'Aiguillon and Mme. de Mirepoix.

He was on good terms with the four chief leaders of the *salons*. He showers compliments on all and writes admiringly to each of her special reception-days—the *mardis* of Mme. de Lambert, the *mercredis* of Mme. du Defand. The former's services are required in securing Morville as protector of the Bordeaux Academy; her psychological keenness is instanced by her analysis of Montesquieu's restlessness abroad.¹¹ Mme. de Tencin, more intimate with the President than any of the others, scolds him for his *distractions*, calls him "mon petit Romain," and gives a capable criticism of the *Esprit des lois*. Mme. de Geoffrin also adopts a rallying tone, though her friendship with Montesquieu was of later and perhaps of shallower growth.¹² Mme. du Deffand likewise knows the President late, but is none the less familiar. All of them *raffolent* concerning the *Esprit des lois*, and generally they write in a tone of sprightliness, with occasional penetration. Their letters to Montesquieu are more revealing than his to them.

He is associated with English people at two epochs of his life: just after his return from that country and after the publication of the *Esprit des lois*. It was a relationship of mutual esteem. We find him communicating with Bulkeley, Martin Ffolkes, Domville, exchanging a literary correspondence with Hume and Warburton, and polite attentions with several others. His Anglomania is conceived in a spirit of true cosmopolitanism; he insists on the advantages of exchanging *lumières*, of mutually translating works and abolishing prejudices.¹³ He is preoccupied, from 1730 on, with the English character and mind, and makes frequent allusions to their ways of doing things. For him, England is the "great tribunal of Europe" in matters of the intellect,

¹¹ I, 263.

¹² On the question of Guasco, and Montesquieu's possible rupture with Mme. de Geoffrin, see the Introduction.

¹³ II, 356.

⁷ I, 409.

⁸ I, 386-87.

⁹ I, 74.

¹⁰ II, 200.

as she will be the last defender of Europe in matters of liberty.¹⁴

The attention given to provincial academies supports Brunetière's belief as to their general importance in the century. Montesquieu takes much more interest in the Academy of Bordeaux than in that of Paris. He is concerned with seeking for it successive protectors, with its buildings, its library, its scientific apparatus and productiveness—especially as encouraging the natural sciences. He is also pleased to belong to the Academy of Nancy and to the English Royal Society.

His taste for physics and mathematics appears in this connection and in his correspondence with Castel and Barbot. Particularly entertaining is the series of long, naïf, self-centered letters of the former cleric, who having doubtless afforded Montesquieu much amusement in this world, was selected by fate to convoy him comfortably out of it. Montesquieu often writes about mathematics and astronomy, microscopes and apparatus for experimentation. His zeal in this respect declined in his later years, but he evidently took no small share in its first vogue.

As regards the works, Hénault furnishes a good criticism of the *Grandeur et décadence des Romains*,¹⁵ and Montesquieu categorically denies the authorship of the *Temple de Gnide*.¹⁶ We learn the exact date of the composition of *Sylla et Eucrate*, concerning which the editors have an interesting note.¹⁷ There is a great deal about the *Esprit des lois*. Montesquieu's statement that he discovered his principles c. 1730 corresponds with M. Dedieu's reasoning, as does the repeated antithesis between moral and physical causes. There are many details as to the composition of the *Lois*, the author's stake in it, his troubles about publication and with the Index. Much of this is parallel to what Voltaire experienced with the *Lettres philosophiques*. Montesquieu evinces an apparent willingness to change expressions and the divisions of the work. Its general recep-

tion, the chorus of praise, its cosmopolitan influence, are all well marked in the letters. There are penetrating bits of criticism, insistence, for example, on the author's *bienveillance* and "laconic eloquence," and occasionally the dissentient voice of a more advanced *philosophe*—Helvétius, Voltaire, Hume—is heard.

The interesting picture of the times here presented scarcely falls within the scope of this paper. The chief topics discussed are such events as changes of ministry and the king's illness; gossip about court affairs, which frequently resembles Cyrano's budget, in that it is always a question of the news of the day; financial stress, famine and plague, are seen as dimming the splendor of the old régime; notably, there is a growing emphasis on *la philosophie*—the word and the idea become generally more popular as the Correspondence advances. There is less about *littérateurs* proper than one might expect; few are conspicuously mentioned besides Lamotte and Voltaire, with regard to whom there are some excellent sidelights.

The tone of the Correspondence is that of gentility. Occasional bluntness scarcely mars the effect of choice style, particularly in the letters of the women. There are elaborate compliments, not necessarily insincere. There are bits of preciousness and the atmosphere of the *salon*, but little that is too free and nothing that is common.

III

The school-edition of the *Lettres persanes*, prepared by Mr. R. L. Cru for the Oxford French Series, is a capable piece of work, provided with a good full introduction and notes. The text used is that of Barckhausen, which does not differ essentially from the text hitherto received. In his annotations, Dr. Cru shows much dependence, generally justified, on those of Barckhausen and Laboulaye. For school purposes, of course, the harem portion of the *Lettres persanes* has to go, and the loss is regrettable only in that the monument thus purified loses a part of its Oriental *cadre* which is characteristic of the century. A few omissions that might have remained will be noted

¹⁴ II, 140, 208.

¹⁵ II, 49.

¹⁶ I, 87.

¹⁷ I, 55.

in the last paragraph of this paper, with which exceptions the editor has shown judgment in his choice of letters. Other features of the edition are several interesting illustrations, occasional slips in English, a good account of the sources, especially of the borrowings from Chardin, an emphasis on the importance of the book as a document, the wise retention of the regular numerotation of the letters, a well-proportioned, adequate view of Montesquieu in the Introduction, and notes that for once are really satisfactory and full—whether for Persian references, affairs of the Regency, or matters bearing on the author.

Some errors of detail and some debatable differences of opinion may be listed in view of a possible second edition.

A. INTRODUCTION.—P. vii. It would be better to emphasize rather the *noblesse de robe* side of Montesquieu's family, since this counted most on his mind and character.—P. viii. The general vogue and cause of the contemporary scientific interest might well be stated.—P. x. The "high hopes of the Regency" seems too idealistic a phrase—witness the *Lettres persanes* themselves.—P. xii. Mme. du Deffand's *salon* was not organized in the early 'twenties.—P. xiii. Was Montesquieu excitable?—P. xvi. In a text-book for American students, more should be made of his influence on our constitution and early statesmen.—P. xviii. The *esprit philosophique*, under whatever name, had hardly been so notable in France "for half a century" before 1721. Also it is doubtful if Montesquieu had La Bruyère's power of observation, if this is meant psychologically.—P. xx. The "artfulness" of the mixture in the *Lettres* may be questioned. Dr. Cru himself speaks of Montesquieu's desultoriness, and the word "jumbled" seems a more appropriate characterization.

B. NOTES.—P. 252. Voltaire is not constant as to the natural virtue of man.—P. 257. The origin of the modern "sick man of Europe" phrase, anticipated by Montesquieu, might well have been assigned to the Czar Nicholas I.—P. 258. The device of making a foreigner fall from the skies is also employed by Voltaire (*Traité de Métaphysique*).—P. 263.

Locating the "Marais" in terms of the Arrondissements would not be helpful to the American students.—P. 273. The family relationship of the religions finds a parallel and a possible source in Swift's *Tale of a Tub*. The connection between Swift and Montesquieu will, when carefully worked out, probably reveal several curious similarities.—P. 276. Fontenelle's *Eloges* are concerned rather with members of the Academy of Sciences.—P. 283. Here, the word *vertu* has not altogether the narrower sense of civic virtue characteristic of the *Esprit des lois*—see the letters on the Troglodytes. An allusion to Montesquieu's own court-disappointment and temporary retirement would seem appropriate.—P. 287. Also an allusion to *Turcaret* in connection with the *traîtres*.—P. 296. Since the Maréchal de Berwick is mentioned, why not recall his friendship with Montesquieu?—P. 303. Are there any other explanations of the *C. de G.*?—P. 304. The Appendix (ranked as *Lettre* 145 previous to Barckhausen) speaks for Montesquieu not only impersonally in the last part, but fictitiously (through Usbek) in the first part.

C. OMITTED LETTERS.—The majority of the following passages should, in my opinion, have been retained. The questionable sentences could have been deleted, and much that is significant would have been thus preserved.

Letter 6 (to give the milder harem background and some self-analysis).—Letter 55: the portions referring to European marriages and the situation of women in the eighteenth century.—Letter 67: the first few paragraphs, containing much of Montesquieu's character and outlook—his cosmopolitanism and old Roman spirit.—Letter 107 (the greater part of this concerns monarchy and the rule of women).—Letters 112–116: the more characteristic portions.

The edition is nevertheless satisfactory in the main. It should render distinct service in any presentation of eighteenth-century ideas to the class-room.

E. PRESTON DARGAN.

The University of Chicago.